

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 9, 11, 12, and 14 have been amended, as well as Paragraph [0018]. The amendments to claims 1-4, 9, 11, 12, and 14 correct minor formal errors. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not narrowing amendments. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

OBJECTIONS

Claim 9 is objected to because of a spelling error, which was also made in the specification. Applicants have amended Claim 9 and Paragraph [0018] of the specification to provide proper spelling. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the withdrawal of the previous rejection of Claims 3, 4, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, specifically regarding the use of improper Markush language. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 has been amended pursuant to the Examiner's suggestion. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fenn et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,838,177). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Examiner states on page 4 of the Office Action that "... 0.1% to 0.95% by weight is within the disclosed range of 1 weight percent, considering significant digits with respect to measurements." Applicants' range of 0.1% to 0.95% by weight is not within the Fenn et al. range. The National Institute of Standards and Technology Guide to SI Units states that "[i]f the digit to be discarded is less than 5, the digit preceding the 5 is not changed." See NIST Guide to SI Units, available at <http://physics.nist.gov/Pubs/SP811/appenB.html>, visited September 27, 2006. The Fenn et al. range of 1 to 8% photoinitiator by weight has one significant figure. When rounding Applicants' range of 0.1% to 0.95% by weight according to the NIST guidelines, the significant figure is 0 with respect to the ".1" portion of the 0.1% in the range value, as that value is less than 5. Even if, as the Examiner asserts, one skilled in the art could modify the teachings of Fenn et al. to provide a non-tacky surface, using the Examiner's significant figure analysis, the Fenn et al. reference would have to be modified to use no photoinitiator (0%) ultimately destroying the teachings of the reference, particularly with respect to curing times and UVA/UVB exposure. Accordingly, the §103 rejection is improper and claims 1 and 11 and all dependents thereon are patentably distinct from Fenn et al. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Additionally, with respect to Examiner's comments regarding the use of natural light, Applicants respectfully point out that the combination of a low photoinitiator

concentration within Applicants' claimed range and natural light is highlighted in Example 3 (0.19% photoinitiator by weight of primer composition). The data in Example 3 and Table 3 demonstrate the adhesion and humidity resistance benefits obtained by using natural light and the low photoinitiator concentration.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 28, 2006

By: Anna M. Budde
Anna M. Budde, Reg. No. 35,085

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

AMB/SDJ/lf-s